



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,852	12/22/2000	James R. Patterson	A-5378	3665
2147	7590	09/27/2004	EXAMINER	
GRACE J FISHEL 11970 BORMAN DRIVE SUITE 220 ST. LOUIS, MO 63146			REIS, TRAVIS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2859	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/747,852	PATTERSON, JAMES R.
	Examiner Travis M Reis	Art Unit 2859

All Participants:

(1) Travis M Reis.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Edward Renner.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 September 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



Diego Gutierrez
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed Applicant's attorney that an appeal brief has been noted as filed and is currently being processed; however, an appeal brief is not a proper response since the only remaining issue in the case is the objection noted in the prior Quayle action. It appears that applicant filed the appeal brief based on paragraph 1 of the the Prior Quayle action in which the Examiner incorrectly gave applicant the option of filing an Appeal Brief. Accordingly, once the Appeal Brief is processed, the examiner will send applicant a Notice of Non-responsive Amendment, setting a one month time period to respond the Quayle action. The applicant needs to file a petition for reconsideration of the objection detailing the reasons why the objection has been overcome, i.e. citing the page and line number where the "means for accessing the true status of the frame" are located or by amending the specification to include said means.